



EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

Pamela J. Riley
Vice President
Federal Regulatory
AirTouch Communications
1818 N Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington D.C. 20036

October 26, 1998

RECEIVED

OCT 26 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Telephone: 202 293-4960
Facsimile: 202 293-4970

Re: Ex Parte Meeting: *Revision of the Commission's Rules to
Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling
Systems* - CC Docket No. 94-102

Dear Ms. Salas:

Pursuant to Section 1.1206 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.1206, I hereby notify the Commission that Steve Sharkey and I met with John Cimko, Nancy Boocker, Ronald Netro, Martin Liebman, and Won Kim of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau on October 23, 1998. We discussed the current status of wireless E911 Phase I deployment and steps that the Commission could take to further facilitate E911 deployment. These include providing uniform liability protection for wireless operators and clarifying that it is the decision of the wireless carriers as to what technology will be employed in delivering E911 service. A summary of the points discussed is provided in the attached material which was distributed during the meeting.

Please direct any inquiries concerning this matter to me at (202) 293-4960.

Sincerely,

Pamela J. Riley
Vice President, Federal Regulatory

cc: John Cimko
Nancy Boocker
Ronald Netro
Martin Liebman
Won Kim

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E

023



E911 Phase I

Pamela Riley
Steve Sharkey
October 23, 1998

E911 Phase I Implementation

- **Status of AirTouch compliance**

Currently meeting requests of 240 PSAPs in 8 states

- **Key challenges**

PSAP role in wireless technology decisions

Lack of uniform liability protection

- **Proposed FCC actions**

Clarification that technology choice determined by wireless operator

Clarification that insurance costs are appropriate compensatory expense

Ruling to provide nationwide liability protection

Uniformity of coverage consistent with FCC policy for nationwide access.

Liability Issues Pose a Barrier to Phase I Implementation

- Lack of uniform liability protection for wireless operators

Need for a nationwide standard on liability protection.

- California, Ohio, other state measures have been defeated.
- California Phase I trial is underway but full state deployment requires resolution of the insurance cost issue.
- California wireless subscribers constitute 10% of users nationwide.

- Carrier exposure is significant.

Radio technology inherently less reliable than wireline options.

New E911 requirements increase complexity and risk of malfunction of a given call.

Broader pool of E911 users: subscribers and non-subscribers alike.

- Liability insurance is not optional in light of large exposure

High insurance premiums validate carrier concerns.

- **States must either adopt laws to protect carriers or bear the cost of private insurance.**

E911 Technology Choice

- FCC clarification of operator responsibility for E911 technology is needed
 - Minnesota
- Single technology for an operator lowers cost of implementation and eases administration
- PSAP selection of technology could mean different technologies in same cellular coverage area
- Different solutions are compatible with PSAPs
 - California trial
- Call Path vs. Non-Call Path

Non-Call Path

- Uses existing call path for voice
- Data routed over separate path using standard signalling
- No upgrades necessary for PSAPs that have been upgraded for enhanced wireline
- Flexible enough to accommodate Phase II and to structure information in accordance with individual PSAP requirements
- Maintains proprietary information of wireless carriers

Call Path

- Requires upgrades at PSAP and selective router
- Current implementation would not accommodate Phase II - likely require additional upgrade